

REMARKS

The Examiner has also stated that the Declaration is defective because the inventive entity information and priority information are incorrect. The inventive entity information originally identified Gerald Peters as the inventor; however, it was subsequently discovered that Arthur Pennington is the correct inventor. Declarations from both Gerald Peters and Arthur Pennington confirming inventorship without deceptive intent are attached. Both are employees of Softlife, Inc., the Assignee of the present application. This case was filed with a Declaration and Power of Attorney from Arthur Pennington.

The Examiner has indicated that improper antecedent basis is found for the term “the collated instruction” in line 13 of Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to include, in line 8, the words “to create collated instructions”. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 over the patent of Martino. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner indicates that Martino (Col. 2, line 55 to Col. 3, line 19, and Col 6, lines 50-55) anticipates Claim 1 which states, “collating the user input data with supplemental instructions for creating a transactional report”. To the contrary, Martino (Col. 3, line 19) states, “data transaction formed by the transaction entry device is transmitted via modem to a local or remote data base server for processing and storage”. In the present device, a server having a microprocessor collates the user input data with the supplemental instructions for creating a transactional report, not merely a transaction such as in Martino. Similarly, in Claim 8, the

Examiner indicates that in Col. 9, lines 19-29, Martino anticipates “generating a transactional report for use by a server wherein the transactional report is generated using the user input data in the first data.” Again, Martino does not have a processor for processing and generating a report, merely a small RAM which operates as an input/output transaction buffer for storing the data streams of the template and the user replies to the prompts in the template during the assembly of a data transaction. Similarly, in claim 18, the Examiner indicates that Martino (Col. 14, lines 20-67) anticipates a designer operator coupled to receive the user input data from the input device, the designer supplying a form responsive to the user input data and generating a program responsive to the user input data, the program providing at least one document selected from the group consisting of statements, summaries and reports relating to the transaction for implementing and editing of the selected document for implementing calculations and for implementing work flow rules. To the contrary, this function is performed by the server in the Martino reference. Accordingly, reconsideration of Claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

Date: 5/20 / 06

Vedder, Price, Kaufman &
Kammholz, P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005

Respectfully submitted,

Robert S. Beiser
Robert S. Beiser
Reg. No. 28,687